



1133 Avenue of the Americas
Suite 1500
New York, New York 10036

(212) 316-9500
rkaplan@kaplanmartin.com

July 16, 2025

BY CM/ECF

The Honorable Lewis J. Liman
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007

Re: Metro. Transp. Auth., et al. v. Duffy, et al., No. 25 Civ. 1413 (LJL)

Dear Judge Liman,

We write on behalf of Plaintiffs the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (“MTA”) and Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority (“TBTA”) pursuant to the parties’ joint letter-motion to expedite dated June 5, which was “So Ordered” by the Court on June 6 and requires that the parties propose page limits for their forthcoming consolidated summary judgment opposition-reply briefs. ECF 139 at 2. Counsel for the parties have conferred and agree that each side should have 50 pages for their consolidated opposition-reply briefs, given the number of issues raised by the briefing to date. In addition, pursuant to an agreement between counsel for Defendants and counsel for the MTA and TBTA, which resolved a dispute as to whether Defendants’ opening brief was properly formatted in accordance with Local Civil Rule 7.1, the parties agree that Plaintiffs and Intervenor-Plaintiffs should collectively have an additional six pages, *i.e.*, up to 56 pages, for their opposition-reply briefs.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Court enter the following order governing the parties’ forthcoming submissions:

- Defendants’ consolidated opposition-reply brief will not exceed 50 pages, excluding nonsubstantive pages; and

- Plaintiffs and Intervenor-Plaintiffs will file one or more consolidated opposition-reply briefs with a total combined length not to exceed 56 pages, excluding nonsubstantive pages.

Counsel conferred on July 16, and all parties consent to the proposed page limits.

Respectfully submitted,



Roberta A. Kaplan

cc: Counsel of Record (via ECF)